

REMARKS

Applicant proposes to amend claim 26 to correct an antecedent basis issue. Specifically, the identifiers "(a)" and "(b)" in claim 26 have no antecedent basis. Applicant intended for claim 26 to recite "(a)" where claim 26 recites "(c)" and intended for claim 26 to recite "(b)" where claim 26 recites "(d)". However, Applicant inadvertently amended claim 26 during prosecution to recite "(c)" and "(d)" where Applicant intended claim 26 to recite "(a)" and "(b)" respectively. Applicant proposes to amend claim 26 to recite "(a)" in place of "(c)" and recite "(b)" in place of "(d)". Because this essentially corrects a typographical error not affecting the merits of claim 26's allowability, further substantive consideration of claim 26 is not required.

M.P.E.P. 714.16 suggests that a proposal for amendments after allowance should be accompanied by remarks that fully and clearly state the reasons on which reliance is placed to show: (1) why the amendment is needed; (2) why the proposed amended or new claims require no additional search; (3) why the claims are patentable; and (4) why they were not presented earlier.

(1) Why the amendment is needed. The amendment is needed to correct an inadvertent error by correcting an antecedent basis issue which, if left unaddressed, would not properly apprise the public of the scope of the invention of Applicant's claim 26. The Applicant's intent to recite "(a)" instead of "(c)" and intent to recite "(b)" instead of "(d)" is clear from the prosecution history and, for example, from claims 2 and 19, which recite "(a)" and "(b)" and do not recite "(c)" or "(d)".

(2) Why the proposed amendment requires no additional search or examination. Because claim 26 has already been examined and allowed reciting "(c)" and "(d)", the amendment herein does not present any substantively new limitation, or any substantively new combination of limitations, that was not earlier examined.

(3) Why the claims are patentable. The new claims are patentable for the same reasons given in Applicant's prior correspondence in this prosecution, because the amendment herein does not substantively change the scope of the claim.

(4) Why they were not earlier presented. The claim as amended herein was not earlier presented because Applicants first identified the matter that is corrected herein upon reviewing the claims as allowed in response to receiving the Notice of Allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, entry and allowance of the amendments and additional claims presented by this amendment is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the

undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if any properly applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-1302 and to credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: September 16, 2009

/AdamCStone#60531/

Adam C. Stone

Reg. No. 60,531

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080x202
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076